



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/606,377	06/28/2000	Puneet Agarwal	P4501	5997

24739 7590 06/13/2003

CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY  
PO BOX 187  
AROMAS, CA 95004

EXAMINER

DUONG, OANH L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

23

2B

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/606,377	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AGARWAL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Oanh L. Duong	<b>Art Unit</b> 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

2B

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Chao et al (Chao) (US 6,338,092 B1) in view of Goertzel et al (Goertzel) (US 6,208,952 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, Chao teaches in a distributed processor system wherein each of the first plurality of processors maintains a copy of the database (see abstract), a method for synchronized maintenance and distribution of the database (see col. 3 lines 22-23) comprising sharing the generated or amended data from the servers to the clients, such that each of the first plurality of processors receives generated and amended data (see col. 5 lines 3-47). Chao does not a processor running the first and second protocols. However, Goertzel teaches registering each of the first plurality of processors with at least one other of the first plurality of processors, creating client-server pairs (see fig. 3), in an arrangement that each of plurality of processors either run or is registered with a processor running the first and second protocols (see col. 1 lines 59-62 and col. 4 line 36-col. 5 line 20). Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 2155

have been obvious to have utilized multiple protocols in Chao as taught by Goertzel because such protocols enable processors (e.g. client or server) in a computer systems to communicate with a wide ranges of other processors on other computer systems.

Regarding claims 2, 8, 14 and 20, Chao teaches registering each of the second plurality of processors with at least one of the first plurality of processors, creating client-server pairs between individual one of the first and second plurality of processor and sharing at least a subset of the database from the servers in the first plurality of processors to the clients in the second plurality of processors (see col. 10 lines 57-67).

Regarding claims 3, 9, 15 and 21, Chao teaches registering each of a third plurality of processors with individual ones of the second plurality of processors, creating client-server pairs between individual ones of the second and the third plurality of processors, enabling clients in the third plurality of processors to receive copies of the subset of the database (see col. 10 lines 57-67).

Regarding claims 4, 10, 16 and 22, Chao teaches clients register with a second processor to create a redundant server-client relationship for fault tolerance (see fig. 3 col. 4 lines 13-17).

Regarding claims 5, 11, 17 and 23, Chao teaches communicates only with the primary server as long as the primary server remains capable, and further comprising a step of activating the secondary server in the event the primary server fails (see col. 7 lines 4-19).

2. Claims 6, 12, 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chao et al (Chao) (US 6,338,092 B1) in view of Goertzel et al (Goertzel) (US 6,208,952 B1) in further view of Gehami et al (Gehami) (US 5,765,171).

Regarding claims 6, 12, 18 and 24, the combination of teachings of Chao and Goertzel does not teach determines the difference and used only the difference in further propagation of copies. However, Gehami teaches upon activation of the second server, a copy of the database is sent to the client which compares that copy with its own copy, determines the difference, and uses only the difference in further propagation of copies (see col. 2 lines 19-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to have utilized the comparing step in the combination of teachings of Chao and Goertzel as taught by Gehami because such comparing step enables the client to copy only data items from the server which have added or changed so as to reduce the processing time.

### ***Conclusion***

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh L. Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM - 4:30PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2155

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



O.D  
June 5, 2003



AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100